

1
2
3
4
5
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
8 AT SEATTLE

9 TOLL OBUON,

10 Plaintiff,

11 v.

12 JUDGE RICHARD D. EADIE et al.,

13 Defendants.
14

CASE NO. C18-1296RSM

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S
MOTIONS FOR A NEW TRIAL, TO
ALTER OR AMEND A JUDGMENT, OR
FOR RECONSIDERATION


15
16 This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff's continued filings. Dkts. #70–#73. Judgment
17 in this case was entered on February 14, 2019. Dkt. #44. On April 2, 2019, the Court denied a
18 variety of Plaintiff's post-judgment filings. Dkt. #69. Plaintiff made the additional filings now
19 before the Court on April 18, 2019. Finding that the documents are untimely under the Federal
20 Rules of Civil Procedure and are otherwise without legal merit, the Court denies Plaintiff relief.

21 Plaintiff's current filings are best regarded as motions for a new trial, motions to alter or
22 amend a judgment, or motions for reconsideration. Dkts. #70–#73. Under the applicable federal
23 rules and this Court's Local Civil Rules, the filings are untimely. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(b)
24 ("motion for a new trial must be filed no later than 28 days after the entry of judgment"); Fed. R.
25 Civ. P. 59(e) ("motion to alter or amend a judgment must be filed no later than 28 days after the
26
27

1 entry of the judgment”); LCR 7(h) (motions for reconsideration disfavored and must “be filed
2 within fourteen days after the order to which it relates is filed”).¹ Moreover, even if the filings
3 were not untimely, they fail to advance cogent legal arguments and reargue theories that the Court
4 has already rejected.

5 Accordingly, the Court, having reviewed the motions and the record herein, finds and
6 ORDERS that Plaintiff’s April 18, 2019 filings (Dkts. #70–#73) are DENIED. This matter
7 remains CLOSED. The Clerk shall mail a copy of this Order to Plaintiff’s last known address.
8

9 DATED this 23 day of April, 2019.

10 

11
12 RICARDO S. MARTINEZ
13 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26
27 ¹ Even if Plaintiff’s filings were interpreted as motions for reconsideration of the Court’s April
2, 2019 Order, they would be untimely as they were filed on April 18, 2019.